

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed January 12, 2009 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11, 13-15 and 30-44 remain in the present application. Claims 1-11, 13-15 and 30-44 have been rejected. Claims 1 and 30 are amended for the purposes of clarification. Applicant does not believe the amendments add new matter. For instance, Applicant directs the Examiner to the descriptions of figures 1A and 4 and in particular paragraph 50 of the corresponding U.S. publication of instant application (U.S. pub no. 2002/0142846).

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for identifying the typographical errors in the claim language. Applicant believes the identified objections have been corrected.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103

From the Office Communication of January 12, 2009,

4. Claims 1-11, 13-15, and 30-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,110,041 to Walker et al. (Walker) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,028,604 to Matthews, III et al. (Matthews).

End of Citation from the Office Communication of January 12, 2009.

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims as amended describe, as recited in claim 1, a master gaming controller configured to output to a video display a user interface that is generated on the gaming machine in response

to commands and data received from the remote host, said user interface configured to allow a

user to modify the preference account information stored on the remote server and to receive the commands and the data from the remote host for generating the user interface on the video display. As an example, in one embodiment, the specification of instant application describes that the user interface may be output as a web-page generated by the remote host via web-browser executed on the gaming machine. Walker describes in its description of FIG. 3 (see Col. 7:1-9 and 45-63) that the CPU 310 of the gaming machine 102 generates a menu of selections on video display area 346 in response to button 370 being activated using a game parameter database 326 stored on the gaming machine. Walker does not teach or suggest that “a master gaming controller configured to output to a video display a user interface that is generated on the gaming machine in response to commands and data received from the remote host.” In Walker, the server 110 (Col. 8: 7-32) only sends the slot machine previously stored player preferences. It does not send commands and data for generating a user interface. Matthews also does not teach or suggest this limitation.

In addition, the combination of Walker and Matthews, does not teach or suggest, as recited in claim 1 for instance, “the user interface configured to display preferences, to receive the preference selections, to display a simulated game outcome presentation to show an effect of the received preference selections on the simulated game outcome presentation, wherein the simulated game outcome presentation is a) generated on the remote host using the preference selections received at the gaming machine and sent to the remote host from the gaming machine and b) output via the user interface in response to the commands and the data received from the remote host.” Office Communication describes that Walker does not teach a simulated outcome presentation.

Matthews teaches that in a home computer running Windows a user can go to the start menu to

number of files specified as preview parameters that from a preview data structure (Col. 15: 18-20 and 45-50) can be specified such that when an application is selected a multimedia presentation that provides information about the application (Col. 14:37-44). Matthews recites “the combination of preview parameters is considered a preview data structure” (Col. 15:18-20) and “present embodiments contemplate the preview data structure to provide for a variety of multimedia presentations” Col. 15: 38-39. The multimedia presentation provides the user with information about the application without having to actually launch the application. In one embodiment, the multimedia presentation may allow the user to at least minimally interact with the multimedia files specified in the preview to create a perception of actually playing the game (Col. 4: 23-30).

It appears in Matthews the multimedia presentations are pre-specified and the user has a choice of which multimedia presentations to select. These multimedia presentations in the preview are fixed and are different from the actual application although as noted they may provide for minimal interaction. The type of interaction with the multimedia presentation is not specified. Matthew describes the user can select different from different files with information about an application is available. Matthews does not teach or suggest as described in the pending claims to display a simulated game outcome presentation to show an effect of the received preference selections on the simulated game outcome presentation. In Matthews, the multimedia applications are different from the actual application containing mostly related information. Further, multimedia presentations with this capability are not described. Therefore, for at least these reasons the combination of Walker in view of Mathews can’t be said to render obvious the pending claims and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in proper form and condition for patentability, and thus request a Notification of Allowance to that effect. It is believed that no fees are due at this time. Should any fee be required for any reason related to this document or application in general, however, then the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fee or fees to Deposit Account No. 504480, referencing Docket No. IGT1P026. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below with any questions or concerns relating to this document or application.

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/David P. Olynick/
David P. Olynick
Reg. No.: 48,615

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100